



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/035,423	01/04/2002	Amnon Ribak	RIBAK2	2434
1444	7590	02/23/2005	EXAMINER	
BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C. 624 NINTH STREET, NW SUITE 300 WASHINGTON, DC 20001-5303			LIN, KELVIN Y	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2142	

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/035,423	RIBAK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kelvin Lin	2142	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-58 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

Detailed Action

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-3, 11-58 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Donoho et al., (US Patent No. 6256664).
3. Regarding claim 1, Donoho teaches a method for providing information regarding A piece of electronic mail (e-mail), comprising:
 - processing a data set containing transmission data associated with the e-mail so as to determine one or more steps in a propagation history of the e-mail, the transmission data including identifiers of a sender of the e-mail and of one or more recipients of at least a portion of the e-mail (Donoho, col.14, l.41-42, col.19, l.1-4, col.20, l.67, col.21, l.1-3, col.38, l.15-19, col.53, l.40-42, here, advisors treated as sender or receiver,).
 - displaying the propagation history (Donoho, col.18, l.32-34).

4. Regarding claim 2, Donoho further discloses a method according to claim 1, wherein processing the data set comprises analyzing transmission information embedded in text of the e-mail (Donoho, col.14, l.39-43) .
5. Regarding claim 3, Donoho further discloses a method according to claim 1, wherein processing the data set comprises analyzing transmission information not contained in text of the e-mail (Donoho, col. 14, l.59-67)
6. Regarding claim 11, Donoho further discloses a method according to claim 1, wherein processing the data set comprises determining two or more steps in the propagation history of the e-mail, the transmission data including for each step in the propagation history identifiers of a sender and one or more recipients of a respective portion of the piece of e-mail, wherein the method comprises:
 - receiving from a user a designation of an electronic mail correspondent (Donoho, col.53, l.41);
 - finding at least one identifier in the transmission data corresponding to the designated correspondent (Donoho, col.53, l.31-43); ; and
 - displaying part of the piece of e-mail responsive to finding the at least one identifier (Donoho, col.53, l.42).
7. Regarding claim 12, Donoho further discloses a method according to claim 11, wherein displaying part of the piece of e-mail comprises displaying e-mail content sent by the correspondent (Donoho, col.19, l.16-19).
8. Regarding claim 13, Donoho further discloses a method according to claim 11,

Art Unit: 2142

wherein displaying part of the piece of e-mail comprises displaying e-mail content sent to the correspondent (Donoho, col.19, l.16-19).

9. Regarding claim 14, Donoho further discloses a method according to claim 11, and comprising:

- determining a location of the correspondent in a hierarchy (Donoho, col.37, l.33-35, employee use organization data treated as hierarchy data, l.55-57)
- displaying the hierarchy (Donoho, col.37, l.42-44, only available on the hand held machine means only display on the hand held machine” ; and
- identifying for the user the location of the correspondent in the hierarchy (Donoho, col.37, l.50-51, “..targeted employees listed in the organizational data base” treated as identify the user in location in the hierarchy).

10. Regarding claim 15, Donoho further discloses a method according to claim 1, and comprising receiving information regarding a relationship relating members in a set, which set includes at least some of: the sender and the one or more recipients, wherein displaying the propagation history comprises displaying the propagation history responsive to the relationship (Donoho, col.91, l.14-16).

11. Regarding claim 16, Donoho further discloses a method according to claim 15, wherein receiving the information comprises receiving geographical information about the members (Donoho, col. 18, l.26-29).

Art Unit: 2142

12. Regarding claim 17, Donoho further discloses a method according to claim 15, wherein receiving the information comprises receiving hierarchical and geographical information about the members (Donoho, col.18, l.26, col.37, l.27-35, by using the inspector data base to have the hierarchical and geographical information).
13. Regarding claim 18, Donoho further discloses a method according to claim 15, wherein receiving the information comprises receiving hierarchical information about the members (Donoho, col. 37, l.28-34).
14. Regarding claim 19, Donoho further discloses a method according to claim 18, wherein receiving hierarchical information comprises receiving, for each one of a plurality of the members, information indicating: (a) who reports to that member and (b) to whom does that member report (Donoho, col.84, l.18-22).
15. Regarding claim 20, Donoho further discloses a method according to claim 18, wherein displaying the propagation history comprises: displaying a hierarchy including the members in the set; and displaying the propagation history with respect to the hierarchy (Donoho, col.37, l.27-44).
16. Regarding claim 21, Donoho further discloses a method according to claim 20, wherein displaying the propagation history with respect to the hierarchy comprises superimposing a representation of the propagation history on the hierarchy (Donoho, col. 37, l.52-65).
17. Claims 22 is rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Raghunandan H., (US Patent No. 6832244).

Art Unit: 2142

18. Regarding claim 22, Raghunandan teaches a method for providing information regarding a piece of electronic mail (e-mail), comprising:
 - scanning the e-mail so as to identify a sender or recipient of at least a portion of the e-mail (Raghunandan, col.7, l.48-51);
 - displaying a hierarchy (Raghunandan, col.7, l.9-12); and
 - indicating on the hierarchy a location of the sender or recipient in the hierarchy (Raghunandan, col.7, l.66-67, col.8, l.1-5).
19. Regarding claims 23-35 have similar limitations as claims 1-10, and 14-16. Therefore, claims 23-35 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-10, and 14-16.
20. Regarding claim 36 has similar limitations as claim 22. Therefore, claim 36 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 22.
21. Regarding claims 37-57 have similar limitations as claims 1-21. Therefore, claims 37-57 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-21.
22. Regarding claim 58 has similar limitations as claim 22. Therefore, claim 58 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 22.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:


(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

23. Claims 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Donoho in view of Raghunandan H., (US Patent No. 6832244).
24. Regarding claims 4-7, Donoho differs from the claimed invention in that it fails to teach the designating a first visual and color symbols for the primary, a second or other visual and color symbols for the secondary recipients. However, Raghunandan teaches the output symbol can be reduces or increased, as desired, depending on the email so that as many symbol as possible can be viewed on the screen at the same time. Also, the graphical display can be used to show the emails in a order and priorities sequence based on the content indicative of hierarchy from the user's perspective, for example, the sample parameter can be configured as Mails from John using Red and the Icon (symbol) is smiley. It also lists another parameter with different color and symbols. (Raghunandan, col.7, l.5-35).
25. Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Donoho and Raghunandan in view of Pulley et al., (PG PUB No. 2002/0087679).

26. Regarding claims 8-10, Donoho and Raghunandan teach all the limitation of claims 8-10 except the animation and graphical movement of the recipient. However, Pulley clearly teaches the visualization metaphor including an animation comprise a path line, which is similar to the movement arrow indicates the moving direction. Also, Pulley further discloses the displaying of email event including things sending email, and receiving email. And the scan event includes things like tracing a route to find a path to the visitor, and the like. (Pulley, col. 8, l.1-14, col.9, 1-13)

27. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the display symbol and color of Donoho as modified by the teaching of Raghunandan, since the symbol and color provide a very complex and powerful capability for analyzing and displaying of nature of email. In addition, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the animation and graphical movement of Donoho as modified by the teaching of Pulley be readily observed.


JACK PULLEY
ATTORNEY

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to application's disclosure.

- Kamakura et al., (Patent No. 6076101) Electronic Mail Processing System With Bouns Point Tracking.
- Gupta et al. (PG PUB No. 2002/0099777) Integrating Collaborative Messaging Into An Electronic Mail Program.
- Gutfreund S. (PG PUB No. 2002/0129106) User-Extensible System For Manipulating Information In A Collaborative Environment.
- NPL – Gulcu et al., Mixing E-mail with Babel, Network and Distributed System Security, 1996, Proceeding of the Symposium on, 22-23 Feb. 1996, pp. 2-16.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kelvin Lin whose telephone number is 703-605-1726. The examiner can normally be reached on Flexible 4/9/5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Harvey can be reached on 703-305-9705. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2142

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kyl
2/10/05